

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,088	09/19/2003	Don M. Hannegan	H055010.0048US0	8979
7:	590 08/16/20	6	EXAMINER	
RICHARD D.		NEUDER, WILLIAM P		
1401 Mckinney	ER & PRICE, LLP	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
suite 2200		3672		
Houston, TX	77010		DATE MAILED: 08/16/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,088	HANNEGAN, DON M.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William P. Neuder	3672	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence addre	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1: after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period versions of the second of the	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timused and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONEI	I. lety filed the mailing date of this comm 0 (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·
Status			
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ju 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		nerits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 and 21-58 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-14 and 21-47 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 48-58 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	vn from consideration.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR	` '
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list 	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been receive I (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No d in this National Sta	age
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa	te	52)

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 48-57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hannegan et al 6,263,982.

Hannegan discloses a method for moving a drilling fluid using a structure S floating on the ocean surface. Floating structure S is coupled to a riser R though a flexible conduit 30. The drilling fluid is moved from the floating structure to an annulus of the riser surrounding tubular 14. A portion of the drilling fluid is moved down the annulus. As to claim 49, the method is used in a drilling method. As to claim 50, tubular 14 is rotatable. As to claim 51, a portion of the drilling fluid is moved down the annulus and up the tubular 14. As to claim 51, the drilling fluid is pressurized to a predetermined pressure. As to claim 53, the flexible conduit is connected to a mud pump whose pump rate controls the pressure and pumps the drilling fluid into the conduit. As to claim 54, the riser is sealed to the tubing by use of a rotating seal. As to claim 55, the seal maintains the pressure. As to claim 56, the flexible conduit communicates drilling fluid below the seal. As to claim 57, the pressure of the drilling fluid in the flexible conduit must be higher than the pressure in the tubular in order for the drilling fluid to flow down the annulus and up the tubular.

Application/Control Number: 10/666,088 Page 3

Art Unit: 3672

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claim 58 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hannegan et al (applied above) in view of Hale et al 5076364.

Hannegan is considered to disclose all of the claimed features except for the formation of a mud cap. Hale et al teaches (column 12, lines 49-55) forming a mud cap in an offshore drilling system. It would have been considered obvious to form a mud cap in the system of Hannegan as taught by Hale for the taught purpose of Hale of eliminating or decreasing the amount of hydrates formed.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim1-14 and 21-47 are allowed.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Neuder whose telephone number is 571-272-7032. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David J. Bagnell can be reached on 571-272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

William P Neuder Primary Examiner Art Unit 3672

W.P.N.